

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 18-10387-RGK (JEMx)	Date	January 8, 2019
Title	<i>VERONICA CARDONA v. TATE & KIRLIN ASSOC., INC., et al</i>		

Present: The Honorable	R. GARY KLAUSNER, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
------------------------	--

Sharon L. Williams (not present)	Not Reported	N/A
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:		Attorneys Present for Defendants:
Not Present		Not Present

Proceedings: **(IN CHAMBERS) ORDER REMANDING CIVIL ACTION TO SUPERIOR COURT**

On November 13, 2018, Veronica Cardona (“Plaintiff”), filed this action against Tate & Kirlin Assoc., Inc. (“Defendant”) alleging one claim for violation of the California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. On December 14, 2018, Defendant removed this action on the ground of federal question.

Removal jurisdiction is governed by statute. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441, et seq. The Ninth Circuit has held unequivocally that the removal statute is construed strictly against removal. *Ethridge v. Harbor House Rest.*, 861 F.2d 1389, 1393 (9th Cir. 1988). The strong presumption against removal jurisdiction means that “the defendant always has the burden of establishing that removal is proper.” *Gaus v. Miles*, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992) (*citing Nishimoto v. Federman-Bachrach & Assocs.*, 903 F.2d 709, 712 n.3 (9th Cir. 1990)); *see also In re Ford Motor Co./Citibank (South Dakota), N.A.*, 264 F.3d 952, 957 (9th Cir. 2001) (“The party asserting federal jurisdiction bears the burden of proving the case is properly in federal court.”).

As to federal question, Defendant has not set forth any federal law or portions of the Constitution that have been violated. The Court’s careful review of the Complaint filed by Plaintiff shows one discrete action for violation of a California statute. The Complaint does not set forth any claims arising under the U.S. Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States for which the Court would have “original jurisdiction.” 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b). Accordingly, any removal based on federal question jurisdiction is improper.

As to diversity jurisdiction, the Complaint seeks actual damages, an award of \$1,000 in statutory damages, and attorney’s fees and costs. Federal jurisdiction based on complete diversity requires that all parties to the action are completely diverse in citizenship, and that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. Defendant has offered no plausible allegation in its Notice as to how the jurisdictional

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	<u>CV 18-10387-RGK (JEMx)</u>	Date	<u>January 8, 2019</u>
Title	<u><i>VERONICA CARDONA v. TATE & KIRLIN ASSOC., INC., et al</i></u>		

threshold has been met.

For the foregoing reasons, the above-entitled case is ordered **REMANDED** to the Superior Court for all further proceedings for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer _____ : _____